



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/065,281

09/30/2002

John F. Braun

F-521

5695

919

7590

06/25/2007

PITNEY BOWES INC.
35 WATERVIEW DRIVE
P.O. BOX 3000
MSC 26-22
SHELTON, CT 06484-8000

EXAMINER

ROBINSON, MYLES D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2625

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

06/25/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/065,281

Applicant(s)

BRAUN ET AL.

Examiner

Myles D. Robinson

Art Unit

2625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 April 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/2/2007.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 4/2/2007 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's amendment was received on 4/2/2007, and has been entered and made of record. Currently, **claims 1 – 20** are pending.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1 – 20** have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Regarding **claims 1 and 11**, the Applicant argues that **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0214681) does not disclose, teach or suggest a digital pointing instrument, or a digital pen, to compose a facsimile (*see Remarks 4/2/2007 [page 7, lines 23 – 26]*).

However, **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) does disclose capturing strokes made by a user writing with a digital pen (*column 2, lines 45 – 57, 62 – 64,*

Art Unit: 2625

column 3, lines 33 – 36 wherein device 100 is a pen-based input system which comprises digitization table 104 and stylus [not shown] which is analogous to a digital pen), the strokes including indications of data including facsimile message data (see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the writing area [i.e. the body of fax] contains facsimile message data and see column 1, lines 51 – 62, column 2, lines 60 – 64 and column 3, lines 33 – 36).

Furthermore, the Applicant argues that Bohan does not disclose, teach or suggest as the main feature composing a facsimile accomplished only with a pen and paper interface (see *Remarks 4/2/2007 [page 7, section 3]*).

However, Tang does disclose composing a facsimile accomplished only with a pen and paper interface (see *Figs. 1 – 3, pen-based input device 100*).

Therefore, the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 1 and 11 are considered not persuasive. Please cite rationale of the grounds of rejection below for further explanation.

4. Regarding **claims 9, 14 and 16**, the Applicant argues that **Seder et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,724) does not disclose, teach or suggest using pen stroke data to determine access to an attachment (see *Remarks 4/2/2007 [page 9, lines 21 – 26 and page 10, lines 11 – 12]*).

However, **Skantze et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,574) in view of Seder does disclose using pen stroke data to determine access to attachment wherein the pen

Art Unit: 2625

stroke data is detected using an optical sensor (see *Fig. 4, sensor 14 [column 8, lines 8 – 12, 56 – 61 and column 9, lines 32 – 38]*).

Therefore, the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 9, 14 and 16 are considered not persuasive. Please cite rationale of the grounds of rejection below for further explanation.

5. Regarding **claims 17 and 19**, the Applicant argues that Seder does not disclose, teach or suggest using the identity of a user to unambiguously identify an attachment (see *Remarks 4/2/2007 [page 9, lines 21 – 26]*).

However, Seder does disclose using the identity of a user to unambiguously identify an attachment (*column 5, lines 39 – 52 wherein the intended recipient(s) are analogous to the attachment identifier which is used along with the user's identify [i.e. user data] to correctly associate and identify documents*). In other words, Seder discloses the following:

a) the identifier which is watermarked in the printed document (i.e. attachment identifier) is stored in association with users whom could be intended recipient(s) in the database 18 (*column 5, lines 45 – 49*);

b) the document is assigned an identifier and associated with a particular user which printed out the document (*column 5, lines 39 – 45*); and

c) a combination of the above discloses methods a and b (*column 5, lines 49 – 52*).

Furthermore, Skantze and Seder are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being optical sensors used in conjunction with printed media in order to digitally manage digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include identifying attachments along with optical sensors used in conjunction with printed media. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to readily access associated online resources when reviewing paper documents, as suggested by Seder (*column 4, line 61 – column 5, line 2*).

Furthermore, **Black** (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956) and Seder are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being identification verification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include authenticating user access to restricted electronic documents using biometric data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to protect confidential documentation while uniquely identifying each document, as suggested by Seder (*column 2, lines 17 – 24, column 4, lines 5 – 13 and column 6, lines 8 – 20*).

Furthermore, **Hou et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 7,180,638), Skantze and Seder are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being remote access to digitized documents. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include attachment identifiers on printed documents to remotely access electronic versions of printed documents or other related electronic data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with a variety of ways to access and/or to operate on digital content related to the printed

Art Unit: 2625

document, as suggested by Seder (*column 1, lines 21 – 67, column 2, lines 16 – 23, column 3, line 37 – column 4, line 4 and column 4, lines 14 – 38*).

Therefore, the Applicant's arguments regarding claims 17 and 19 are considered not persuasive. Please cite rationale of the grounds of rejection below for further explanation.

6. Applicant's arguments in regards to **claim 8** (see *Remarks 4/2/2007 [page 9, lines 5 – 6]*) fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The examiner has considered the references listed in the Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) submitted on 4/2/2007 (see attached PTO-1449).

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the command data including profile selection data (as recited in claim 6) must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended

replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the examiner does not accept the changes, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Objections

9. The following quotation of 37 CFR 1.75(a) is the basis of the objection:
 - (a) The specification must conclude with a claim particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.
10. **Claims 2 – 10, 17 and 18** are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(a) as failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention or discovery.

Claim 2 recites the limitation "a user" in line 2 of the claim after the limitation "a user" was claimed in line 2 of the parent claim 1. The applicant has failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim if the applicant is referring to ***the same, instant*** "user" or a

unique and distinctly different "user" within the claim. All claims dependent upon this claim suffer the same deficiency and, therefore, are objected to as well.

11. **Claim 9** recites the limitation "an attachment identifier" in line 2 of the claim after the limitation "an attachment identifier" was claimed in line 8 of the parent claim 1. The applicant has failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim if the applicant is referring to ***the same, instant*** "attachment identifier" or ***a unique and distinctly different*** "attachment identifier" within the claim. All claims dependent upon this claim suffer the same deficiency and, therefore, are objected to as well.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

12. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

13. **Claim 20** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the user identification" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Art Unit: 2625

14. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

15. **Claims 11 – 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) in view of **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0214681) in view of **Hou et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 7,180,638) in view of **Fahraeus** (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,756) and further in view of **Black** (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956).

Referring to **claim 11**, Tang discloses a system (see *Figs. 1 – 3, pen-based input device 100*) for composing a facsimile comprising:

a processor (see *Fig. 3, micro controller 300 [column 3, lines 47 – 51 and 55 – 66]*),

a storage device (see *Fig. 3, memories 302, 303 [column 3, lines 47 – 51 and 55 – 66]*) connected to the processor,

the storage device storing a logic program (*column 3, lines 55 – 66*),

the processor operative with the logic program to perform:

capturing strokes made by a user writing with a digital pen (*column 2, lines 45 – 57, 62 – 64, column 3, lines 33 – 36 wherein device 100 is a pen-based input system which comprises digitization table 104 and stylus [not shown] which is analogous to a digital pen*) on a media (*column 2, lines 62 – 64 and column 3, lines 15 – 22*), the strokes including indications of data including facsimile message data (see *Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the writing area [i.e. the body of fax] contains facsimile message data and see column 1, lines 51 – 62, column 2,*

lines 60 – 64 and column 3, lines 33 – 36) and command data (see Fig. 2, dialing means 203 and Figs. 8 – 9 [column 3, lines 38 – 40 and column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 21]),

processing the strokes in order to determine a recipient designated by the strokes (see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein dialer means designates a recipient [column 3, lines 38 – 40 and column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 21]),

determining a template for the facsimile message using the strokes (see Fig. 2 wherein PC software 204 in conjunction with ThinkScribe digitizer 201 responds to handwriting and pen movement in order to accept fax templates [column 3, lines 29 – 42, 55 – 66, column 6, lines 22 – 26 and 36 – 44]),

wherein the command data includes an indication of a send facsimile command (column 5, lines 56 – 58),

composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data (see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the writing area [i.e. the body of fax] contains facsimile message data and see column 1, lines 51 – 62, column 2, lines 60 – 64 and column 3, lines 33 – 36), and

sending the facsimile message to the recipient (see Fig. 2, dialing means 203 and see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the dialer means and the field marked To: designates the recipient [column 3, lines 38 – 40 and column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 21]) but does not explicitly disclose a media having a pattern, the processor operative with the logic program to perform: determining a template for a cover page for the facsimile message using the pattern, capturing user

authentication information related to the user, processing the strokes in order to determine at least one attachment requested for the facsimile message, requesting and then receiving the at least one determined attachment from a server that is remote from the digital pen, composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data and the at least one attachment.

Bohan discloses the processor (see *Figs. 2 – 3, processing device 200, 300*) operative with the logic program (see *Figs. 2 – 3, memory 202, 302 [paragraphs 0019, 0022, 0023 and 0026 – 0027]*) to perform:

determining a template for a cover page for the facsimile message using user input data (see *Fig. 4, step 408 [paragraph 0031], Fig. 5B, step 528 [paragraph 0039] and Fig. 6B, step 630 [paragraph 0046]*),

processing the user input data in order to determine at least one attachment requested for the facsimile message (see *Fig. 4, step 400 [paragraph 0029], Fig. 5B, steps 514 – 516 [paragraphs 0036 - 0037], Fig. 6A, the facsimile control program 318 is initiated from user application 316 in step 600 [paragraphs 0042 – 0043] and Fig. 6B, steps 616 – 618 [paragraph 0045]*),

requesting and then receiving the at least one determined attachment (see *Figs. 5B and 6B, wherein steps 512, 614 has the option of an affirmative decision which designates a user request for an attachment, then steps 514, 616 wherein a user identifies the remote location from which to attach data and then steps 518, 620 wherein the attachment data is retrieved from the remote location designated in steps 516, 618 [paragraphs 0036 – 0037 and 0045]*),

composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data and the at least one attachment (see Fig. 4, step 410 [paragraph 0032], Fig. 5B, steps 530 – 534 [paragraph 0040] and Fig. 6B, steps 632 – 636 [paragraph 0046]), and

sending the facsimile message to the recipient (see Fig. 4, step 412, Fig. 5B, step 536 and Fig. 6B, step 638) but does not explicitly disclose a media having a pattern, the processor operative with the logic program to perform: determining a template using the pattern, capturing user authentication information related to the user, requesting and then receiving the at least one determined attachment from a server that is remote from the digital pen.

Hou discloses the processor (see Fig. 10, CPU 1006) operative with the logic program (see Fig. 10, memory 1008, removable media devices 1019, 1012 [column 10, line 15 – column 11, line 14]) to perform:

requesting (see Fig. 4 wherein field 414 is designated for manually inputting the file to be attached to the fax message [column 5, lines 8 – 17, column 7, lines 17 – 20 and column 7, line 38]) and then receiving the at least one determined attachment (see Fig. 2, Web client 104 receives files and other information from Web fax server 102 [column 4, lines 36 – 40] and see Fig. 6, step 621 wherein HTTP server 304 launches the CGI application 306 after receiving information from field 414 [column 8, lines 19 – 21 and 48 – 51] such that the CGI application 306 reads streams of client data to determine the fax message data [column 5, lines 53 – 63, column 6, lines 2 – 6, 20 – 21 and 24 – 26] and the attached file to the fax message [column 5, lines 53 – 63, column 6, lines 2 – 6, 21 – 22, 26 – 28 and 56 – 67]) from a server that is remote from the

Art Unit: 2625

transmitting side device (see Fig. 3, Web fax server comprising HTTP server 304 is remotely located from Web client 104 [column 4, lines 36 – 40, column 5, lines 20 – 21, 35 – 37, column 6, lines 5 – 6, 21 – 22 and 26 – 28 wherein temporary files [i.e. files to be attached] can be stored anywhere]),

composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data and the at least one attachment (see Fig. 3, CGI application 306, file converter 314 and see Fig. 9, step 906 [column 3, lines 5 – 9, column 6, lines 56 – 67 and column 9, lines 62 – 65]), and

sending the facsimile message to the recipient (see Fig. 4, field 418 [column 1, lines 29 – 35 and column 7, lines 40 – 42]) but does not explicitly disclose a media having a pattern, the processor operative with the logic program to perform: determining a template using the pattern, capturing user authentication information related to the user.

Fahraeus discloses a media (see Figs. 1 – 2, sheet 1 and Fig. 3, sheet of paper 101) having a pattern (see Figs. 1 – 2, position code 4, symbols 6a, 6b [column 7, lines 41 – 51, column 8, lines 10 – 22 and 35 – 41] and Fig. 3, symbols 104 [column 12, line 59 – column 13, line 11]), the processor (see Fig. 6, processing means 16 [column 8, lines 28 – 32, column 18, lines 1 – 6]) operative with the logic program (column 6, lines 43 – 48) to perform:

determining a template using the strokes (see Fig. 6 [column 3, lines 41 – 44 and column 17, lines 49 – 60] and Fig. 7, device 72 [column 18, lines 24 – 33] and see column 5, lines 18 – 22, 49 – 53 and column 6, lines 56 – 63 wherein order alternatives

Art Unit: 2625

[i.e. documents such as receipts, reservations, invoices, bills, tickets, etc.] are analogous to templates which are based upon the selection of information alternatives from the pen strokes on paper) and the pattern (see Fig. 2, position code 4, symbols 6a, 6b and see Fig. 7, product 71 [column 18, lines 24 – 33]) but does not explicitly disclose the processor operative with the logic program to perform: capturing user authentication information related to the user.

Black discloses the processor operative with the logic program to perform:

capturing user authentication information related to the user (see Figs. 2A - 2B, unique grip 30 [column 7, line 37 – column 8, line 56, column 10, lines 29 – 65 and column 19, lines 47 – 63] wherein biometric information unique to the user, i.e. physical features, fingerprints, voice recognition, DNA, point pressure, speed of signing, etc., is used to authenticate the user and stylus 15 includes biometric information measuring instruments such as pressures sensors to detect stroke pressure, Le. point pressure, gyroscopes to measure the angle of the pen, L e. pen attitude, and an accelerometer to measure stroke speed).

Tang, Bohan and Hou are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being facsimile systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include determining a template for a cover page for the facsimile message along with facsimile systems. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve upon cover pages, which are well known in the art, by automatically counting the number of pages to be

Art Unit: 2625

faxed and updating the cover sheet to reflect that count, as suggested by Bohan (*paragraphs 0002 – 0004 and 0007*).

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include requesting then receiving attachments from a remote server along with facsimile systems. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to enable users to immediately and easily access the network fax machine over a network (i.e. the Internet) at a remote client workstation wherein the network fax machine retrieves fax messages and sends attachments to PC fax modems, as suggested by Hou (*column 1, line 41 – column 2, line 14, column 2, lines 24 – 29, 41 – 67 and column 3, lines 5 – 9*).

Tang and Fahraeus are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being pen-based computer systems generating data from paper media. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include determining templates using the strokes of a pen and the pattern on the paper media along with pen-based computer systems. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide a flexible and simple manner of automatically creating orders [i.e. documents such as receipts, reservations, invoices, bills, tickets, etc.], as suggested by Fahraeus (*column 1, lines 49 – 50, column 2, lines 10 – 31, column 3, lines 22 – 59, column 5, lines 49 – 53 and column 6, lines 56 – 63*).

Tang and Black are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being pen-enabled computer devices within digital communication networks. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2625

to include a digital pen to capture data unique to the user for authenticity verification along with pen-enabled computer devices. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to protect the privacy and integrity of user accounts and to use the physical biometric attributes unique to a user in order to overcome the disadvantages of other security methods, such as lost, stolen or fraudulent cards, PIN numbers, signatures, etc., as suggested by Black (*column 1, lines 42 – 57, column 2, lines 9 – 40, 52 – 55, column 3, lines 21 – 40 and column 4, lines 4 – 43*).

Referring to **claim 12**, Black discloses the system further wherein the user authentication information includes biometric data (*column 7, line 37 – column 8, line 56 wherein stylus 15 wherein stylus 15 includes biometric information measuring instruments such as pressures sensors to detect stroke pressure, i.e. point pressure, gyroscopes to measure the angle of the pen, i.e. pen attitude, and an accelerometer to measure stroke speed*).

Referring to **claim 13**, Black discloses the system further wherein the biometric data includes pen stroke data including stroke pressure, stroke speed and pen attitude (*column 7, line 37 – column 8, line 56 and column 19, lines 47 – 63 wherein stylus 15 includes biometric information measuring instruments such as pressures sensors to detect stroke pressure, i.e. point pressure, gyroscopes to measure the angle of the pen, i.e. pen attitude, and an accelerometer to measure stroke speed*).

16. **Claims 1, 2, 6 and 7** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) in view of **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant

Publication No. 2003/0214681) and further in view of **Skantze et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,574).

Referring to **claim 1**, Tang discloses a method for composing a facsimile message comprising:

capturing strokes made by a user writing with a pointing instrument (*column 2, lines 45 – 57, 62 – 64, column 3, lines 33 – 36 wherein device 100 is a pen-based input system which comprises digitization table 104 and stylus [not shown] which is analogous to a pointing instrument*) that include indications of data including facsimile message data (*see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the writing area [i.e. the body of fax] contains facsimile message data and see column 1, lines 51 – 62, column 2, lines 60 – 64 and column 3, lines 33 – 36*) and command data (*see Fig. 2, dialing means 203 and Figs. 8 – 9 [column 3, lines 38 – 40 and column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 21]*),

processing the strokes in order to determine a recipient designated by the strokes (*see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein dialer means designates a recipient [column 3, lines 38 – 40 and column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 21]*),

determining a template for the facsimile message using the strokes (*see Fig. 2 wherein PC software 204 in conjunction with ThinkScribe digitizer 201 responds to handwriting and pen movement in order to accept fax templates [column 3, lines 29 – 42, 55 – 66, column 6, lines 22 – 26 and 36 – 44]*),

composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data (*see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the writing area [i.e. the body of fax] contains facsimile message data and see column 1, lines 51 – 62, column 2, lines 60 – 64 and column 3, lines 33 – 36*), and

sending the facsimile message to the recipient (*see Fig. 2, dialing means 203 and see Figs. 8 – 9 wherein the dialer means and the field marked To: designates the recipient [column 3, lines 38 – 40 and column 5, line 50 – column 6, line 21]*) but does not explicitly disclose the method further comprising determining a template for a cover page for the facsimile message using the strokes, processing the strokes in order to determine an attachment identifier relating to at least one attachment requested for the facsimile message, and requesting the at least one attachment from a server that is remote from the pointing instrument using the attachment identifier, receiving the at least one attachment from the server.

Bohan discloses the method further comprising:

determining a template for a cover page for the facsimile message using user input data (*see Fig. 4, step 408 [paragraph 0031], Fig. 5B, step 528 [paragraph 0039] and Fig. 6B, step 630 [paragraph 0046]*),

processing the user input data in order to determine at least one attachment requested for the facsimile message (*see Fig. 4, step 400 [paragraph 0029], Fig. 5B, steps 514 – 516 [paragraphs 0036 - 0037], Fig. 6A, the facsimile control program 318 is initiated from user application 316 in step 600 [paragraphs 0042 – 0043] and Fig. 6B, steps 616 – 618 [paragraph 0045]*),

requesting and then receiving the at least one determined attachment (*see Figs. 5B and 6B, wherein steps 512, 614 has the option of an affirmative decision which designates a user request for an attachment, then steps 514, 616 wherein a user identifies the remote location from which to attach data and then steps 518, 620 wherein*

the attachment data is retrieved from the remote location designated in steps 516, 618 [paragraphs 0036 – 0037 and 0045]),

composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data and the at least one attachment (see *Fig. 4, step 410 [paragraph 0032], Fig. 5B, steps 530 – 534 [paragraph 0040] and Fig. 6B, steps 632 – 636 [paragraph 0046]*); and

sending the facsimile message to the recipient (see *Fig. 4, step 412, Fig. 5B, step 536 and Fig. 6B, step 638*) but does not explicitly disclose the method further comprising processing the strokes in order to determine an attachment identifier relating to at least one attachment requested for the facsimile message, and requesting the at least one attachment from a server that is remote from the pointing instrument using the attachment identifier, receiving the at least one attachment from the server.

Skantze discloses the method further comprising:

capturing strokes made by a user with a pointing instrument (see *Fig. 4 [column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7, column 9, lines 32 – 38 and column 13, lines 51 – 53]*) that include indications of data including facsimile message data (see *Fig. 6, message field 25 [column 10, line 57 – column 11, line 17] and see Fig. 8, simple form 31 [column 12, lines 33 – 38]*) and command data (see *Fig. 5, buttons 22, 23 [column 9, lines 48 – 61] and see Fig. 8, send button 30*),

processing the strokes in order to determine a recipient designated by the strokes (see *Fig. 7, address field 29 [column 2, lines 35 – 49, column 11, lines 31 – 61, column 12, lines 31 – 45, column 13, lines 4 – 8 and 13 – 18]*),

processing the strokes in order to determine an attachment identifier relating to at least one attachment requested for the facsimile message (*column 2, lines 35 – 49, column 11, lines 31 – 61, column 12, lines 42 – 43, 46 – 58 and column 13, lines 57 – 60 wherein logotypes, business card holder's vcf file, image files, product information or a standard type non-disclosure agreement, etc. are analogous to attachments to the facsimile message and see column 2, lines 27 – 34 and column 12, lines 46 – 58 wherein the check boxes indicating additional information to attach [i.e. product information, etc.] are analogous to pen strokes which identify the quantity and type of attachment to the facsimile message*),

requesting the at least one attachment from a server that is remote from the pointing instrument (*column 10, lines 37 – 46 and column 11, lines 21 – 30*) using the attachment identifier (*column 12, lines 46 – 55 wherein additional information to be attached is identified by the check boxes and forwarded may be stored and fetched from the server*),

receiving the at least one attachment from the server (*column 12, lines 46 – 55*),
composing the facsimile message using the facsimile message data and the at least one attachment (*column 2, lines 35 – 49, column 11, lines 31 – 61, column 12, lines 42 – 43, 46 – 58 and column 13, lines 57 – 60*), and

sending the facsimile message to the recipient (*see Fig. 5, buttons 22, 23 [column 9, line 62 – column 10, line 29] and see Fig. 8, send button 30*).

Tang, Bohan and Skantze are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being facsimile systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include determining a template for a cover page for the facsimile message along with facsimile systems. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to improve upon cover pages, which are well known in the art, by automatically counting the number of pages to be faxed and updating the cover sheet to reflect that count, as suggested by Bohan (*paragraphs 0002 – 0004 and 0007*).

Tang and Skantze are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being pen-based facsimile systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include processing pen strokes to request attachments to the facsimile message along with a pen-based facsimile system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently allow business card recipients to transfer and to retain business card information, whether the business card is misplaced or not, by combining digital communications with traditional practices of exchanging personalized business cards, as suggested by Skantze (*column 1, line 9 – column 2, line 49*).

Referring to **claim 2**, Skantze discloses the method further wherein the pointing instrument is a digital pen (*see Fig. 4 [column 7, line 66 – column 8, line 7, column 9, lines 32 – 38 and column 13, lines 51 – 53]*) and strokes are provided by a user writing on a paper media having a pattern (*see Figs. 1 – 3 [column 1, lines 15 – 21 and column 3, lines 33 – 55], see Figs. 5 – 10, business card 21 [column 9, lines 3 – 12, column 10, lines 60 – 62 and column 12, lines 31 – 45]*).

Referring to **claim 6**, Skantze discloses the method further wherein the command data includes an indication of a send facsimile command (see *Fig. 5, buttons 22, 23 [column 9, line 62 – column 10, line 29] and see Fig. 8, send button 30*), and the command data includes profile selection data (column 2, lines 27 – 34 and column 12, lines 46 – 58 wherein check boxes which are arranged in a pre-determined template format are selected by pen strokes to add additional information to the message text such that it is analogous to commanding the selection of profile data).

Referring to **claim 7**, Skantze discloses the method further wherein the send facsimile command is indicated by the user writing a stroke in a segregated field of the media (see *Fig. 5, buttons 22, 23 [column 9, line 62 – column 10, line 29] and see Fig. 8, send button 30*).

17. **Claims 3 – 5** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) in view of **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0214681) in view of **Skantze et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,574) and further in view of **Black** (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956).

Referring to **claim 3**, Tang, Bohan and Skantze disclose the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 2 but does not explicitly disclose the method further comprising capturing user authentication information related to the user.

Black discloses the processor operative with the logic program to perform:
capturing user authentication information related to the user (see *Figs. 2A - 2B, unique grip 30 [column 7, line 37 – column 8, line 56, column 10, lines 29 – 65 and*

Art Unit: 2625

column 19, lines 47 – 63] wherein biometric information unique to the user, i.e. physical features, fingerprints, voice recognition, DNA, point pressure, speed of signing, etc., is used to authenticate the user and stylus 15 includes biometric information measuring instruments such as pressures sensors to detect stroke pressure, L.e. point pressure, gyroscopes to measure the angle of the pen, L.e. pen attitude, and an accelerometer to measure stroke speed).

Tang, Skantze and Black are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being pen-enabled computer devices within digital communication networks. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include a digital pen to capture data unique to the user for authenticity verification along with pen-enabled computer devices. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to protect the privacy and integrity of user accounts and to use the physical biometric attributes unique to a user in order to overcome the disadvantages of other security methods, such as lost, stolen or fraudulent cards, PIN numbers, signatures, etc., as suggested by Black (*column 1, lines 42 – 57, column 2, lines 9 – 40, 52 – 55, column 3, lines 21 – 40 and column 4, lines 4 – 43*).

Referring to **claim 4**, Black discloses the system further wherein the user authentication information includes biometric data (*column 7, line 37 – column 8, line 56 wherein stylus 15 wherein stylus 15 includes biometric information measuring instruments such as pressures sensors to detect stroke pressure, i.e. point pressure, gyroscopes to measure the angle of the pen, i.e. pen attitude, and an accelerometer to measure stroke speed*).

Referring to **claim 5**, Black discloses the system further wherein the biometric data includes pen stroke data including stroke pressure, stroke speed and pen attitude (*column 7, line 37 – column 8, line 56 and column 19, lines 47 – 63 wherein stylus 15 includes biometric information measuring instruments such as pressures sensors to detect stroke pressure, i.e. point pressure, gyroscopes to measure the angle of the pen, i.e. pen attitude, and an accelerometer to measure stroke speed*).

18. **Claims 14 – 16, 19 and 20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) in view of **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0214681) in view of **Hou et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 7,180,638) in view of **Fahraeus** (U.S. Patent No. 6,502,756) in view of **Black** (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956) in view of **Skantze et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,574) and further in view of **Seder et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,724).

Referring to **claim 14**, Tang, Bohan, Hou, Fahraeus and Black disclose the system as discussed above in the rejection of claim 13 but does not explicitly disclose the system further wherein the pen stroke data includes an attachment identifier identifying the at least one attachment, further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform: identifying the at least one attachment using the biometric data, authenticating the user using the user authentication information, and verifying user permission to access the at least one attachment file and stopping the facsimile message composition process if the user does not have permission to access the at least one attachment file.

Skantze discloses the system further wherein:

capturing strokes made by a user writing with a digital pen includes capturing strokes with an optical sensor (see *Fig. 4, sensor 14 [column 8, lines 8 – 12, 56 – 61 and column 9, lines 32 – 38]*),

the pen stroke data includes an attachment identifier identifying the at least one attachment (*column 2, lines 35 – 49, column 11, lines 31 – 61, column 12, lines 42 – 43, 46 – 58 and column 13, lines 57 – 60 wherein logotypes, business card holder's vcf file, image files, product information or a standard type non-disclosure agreement, etc. are analogous to attachments to the facsimile message and see column 2, lines 27 – 34 and column 12, lines 46 – 58 wherein the check boxes indicating additional information to attach [i.e. product information, etc.] are analogous to pen strokes which identify the quantity and type of attachment to the facsimile message*), further comprising the processor operative with the logic program (*column 8, lines 16 – 21, 49 – 55, column 10, lines 30 – 36 and column 11, lines 21 – 61*) but does not explicitly disclose the system further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform: identifying the at least one attachment using the biometric data, authenticating the user using the user authentication information, and verifying user permission to access the at least one attachment file and stopping the facsimile message composition process if the user does not have permission to access the at least one attachment file.

Seder discloses the system wherein the data includes an attachment identifier identifying the at least one attachment (*see Fig. 1, watermark data payload that is to be used to identify the printed page is either generated internally by the printer driver 14 or*

received via external input 16 [column 2, lines 17 – 24, 44 – 51 and column 3, lines 11 – 26]), further comprising the processor operative with the logic program (see Fig. 1, user computer 20 comprising application program 12 and printer driver 14) to perform:

identifying the at least one attachment using the biometric data (column 4, lines 5 – 13 and column 5, lines 39 – 45),

authenticating the user using the user authentication information (column 4, lines 5 – 13), and

verifying user permission to access the at least one attachment file and stopping the facsimile message composition process if the user does not have permission to access the at least one attachment file (column 4, lines 5 – 13).

Tang, Fahraeus, Black and Skantze are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being pen-enabled computer devices within digital communication networks. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include processing pen strokes to request attachments to the facsimile message along with a pen-based facsimile system. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to conveniently allow business card recipients to transfer and to retain business card information, whether the business card is misplaced or not, by combining digital communications with traditional practices of exchanging personalized business cards, as suggested by Skantze (*column 1, line 9 – column 2, line 49*).

Skantze and Seder are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being optical sensors used in conjunction with printed media in order to

Art Unit: 2625

digitally manage digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include identifying attachments along with optical sensors used in conjunction with printed media. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to readily access associated online resources when reviewing paper documents, as suggested by Seder (*column 4, line 61 – column 5, line 2*).

Hou, Skantze and Seder are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being remote access to digitized documents. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include attachment identifiers on printed documents to remotely access electronic versions of printed documents or other related electronic data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with a variety of ways to access and/or to operate on digital content related to the printed document, as suggested by Seder (*column 1, lines 21 – 67, column 2, lines 16 – 23, column 3, line 37 – column 4, line 4 and column 4, lines 14 – 38*).

Black and Seder are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being identification verification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include authenticating user access to restricted electronic documents using biometric data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to protect confidential documentation while uniquely identifying each document, as suggested by Seder (*column 2, lines 17 – 24, column 4, lines 5 – 13 and column 6, lines 8 – 20*).

Referring to **claim 15**, Bohan discloses the system further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform:

determining determined message data using the attachment (see Fig. 3, computing device 104 comprising memory 302 with fax control program 318, Fig. 4, steps 406 [paragraphs 0025 and 0031 wherein facsimile control program 318 determines the number of attached pages to enter on a cover page, i.e. message data, based the total number pages attached in the transmission, i.e. attachments]), and

modifying the facsimile message using the determined message data (see Fig. 3, computing device 104 comprising memory 302 with fax control program 318, Fig. 4, step 408 [paragraphs 0025 and 0031 wherein facsimile control program 318 modifies and generates a cover page, i.e. facsimile message, based upon the total number of pages attached in the transmission, i.e. determined message data]).

Referring to **claim 16**, the rationale provided in the rejection of claim 14 is incorporated herein. In addition, the system of claim 14 embodies the equivalent limitations of the system of claim 16.

Referring to **claim 19**, Seder discloses the system and method further wherein, the attachment identifier ambiguously identifies the at least one attachment, further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform:

unambiguously identifying the at least one attachment using a combination of data including at least the attachment identifier and the user data (column 5, lines 39 – 52 wherein the intended recipient(s) are analogous to the attachment identifier which is

used along with the user's identify [i.e. user data] to correctly associate and identify documents).

Referring to **claim 20**, Seder discloses the system further wherein, the processor identifies a user and then uses the user identification to verify permission to access the at least one attachment (*column 4, lines 5 – 13*).

19. **Claims 9, 10, 17 and 18** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) in view of **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0214681) in view of **Skantze et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,574) in view of **Black** (U.S. Patent No. 6,307,956) in view of and further in view of **Seder et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,917,724).

Referring to **claim 9**, Skantze discloses the method further wherein:

capturing strokes made by a user writing with a digital pen includes capturing strokes with an optical sensor (*see Fig. 4, sensor 14 [column 8, lines 8 – 12, 56 – 61 and column 9, lines 32 – 38]*),

the pen stroke data includes an attachment identifier identifying the at least one attachment (*column 2, lines 35 – 49, column 11, lines 31 – 61, column 12, lines 42 – 43, 46 – 58 and column 13, lines 57 – 60 wherein logotypes, business card holder's vcf file, image files, product information or a standard type non-disclosure agreement, etc. are analogous to attachments to the facsimile message and see column 2, lines 27 – 34 and column 12, lines 46 – 58 wherein the check boxes indicating additional information to attach [i.e. product information, etc.] are analogous to pen strokes which identify the*

quantity and type of attachment to the facsimile message), further comprising the processor operative with the logic program (column 8, lines 16 – 21, 49 – 55, column 10, lines 30 – 36 and column 11, lines 21 – 61).

However, neither Tang, Bohan, Skantze nor Black explicitly disclose the system further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform: identifying the at least one attachment using the biometric data, authenticating the user using the user authentication information, and verifying user permission to access the at least one attachment file and stopping the facsimile message composition process if the user does not have permission to access the at least one attachment file.

Seder discloses the system wherein the data includes an attachment identifier identifying the at least one attachment (*see Fig. 1, watermark data payload that is to be used to identify the printed page is either generated internally by the printer driver 14 or received via external input 16 [column 2, lines 17 – 24, 44 – 51 and column 3, lines 11 – 26]*), further comprising the processor operative with the logic program (*see Fig. 1, user computer 20 comprising application program 12 and printer driver 14*) to perform:

identifying the at least one attachment using the biometric data (*column 4, lines 5 – 13 and column 5, lines 39 – 45*),

authenticating the user using the user authentication information (*column 4, lines 5 – 13*), and

verifying user permission to access the at least one attachment file and stopping the facsimile message composition process if the user does not have permission to access the at least one attachment file (*column 4, lines 5 – 13*).

Art Unit: 2625

Skantze and Seder are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being optical sensors used in conjunction with printed media in order to digitally manage digital content. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include identifying attachments along with optical sensors used in conjunction with printed media. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to readily access associated online resources when reviewing paper documents, as suggested by Seder (*column 4, line 61 – column 5, line 2*).

Skantze and Seder are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, being remote access to digitized documents. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include attachment identifiers on printed documents to remotely access electronic versions of printed documents or other related electronic data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to provide the user with a variety of ways to access and/or to operate on digital content related to the printed document, as suggested by Seder (*column 1, lines 21 – 67, column 2, lines 16 – 23, column 3, line 37 – column 4, line 4 and column 4, lines 14 – 38*).

Black and Seder are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being identification verification systems. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include authenticating user access to restricted electronic documents using biometric data. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to protect confidential

Art Unit: 2625

documentation while uniquely identifying each document, as suggested by Seder (column 2, lines 17 – 24, column 4, lines 5 – 13 and column 6, lines 8 – 20).

Referring to **claim 10**, Bohan discloses the system further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform:

determining determined message data using the attachment (see Fig. 3, computing device 104 comprising memory 302 with fax control program 318, Fig. 4, steps 406 [paragraphs 0025 and 0031 wherein facsimile control program 318 determines the number of attached pages to enter on a cover page, i.e. message data, based the total number pages attached in the transmission, i.e. attachments]), and

modifying the facsimile message using the determined message data (see Fig. 3, computing device 104 comprising memory 302 with fax control program 318, Fig. 4, step 408 [paragraphs 0025 and 0031 wherein facsimile control program 318 modifies and generates a cover page, i.e. facsimile message, based upon the total number of pages attached in the transmission, i.e. determined message data]).

Referring to **claim 17**, Seder discloses the system and method further wherein, the attachment identifier ambiguously identifies the at least one attachment, further comprising the processor operative with the logic program to perform:

unambiguously identifying the at least one attachment using a combination of data including at least the attachment identifier and the user data (column 5, lines 39 – 52 wherein the intended recipient(s) are analogous to the attachment identifier which is used along with the user's identify [i.e. user data] to correctly associate and identify documents).

Referring to **claim 18**, Bohan discloses the method further wherein,
the determined message comprises the total number of pages of the composed facsimile message (*see Fig. 4, step 406 [paragraph 0031], Fig. 5B, step 526 [paragraph 0039] and Fig. 6B, step 628 [paragraph 0046]*), and
modifying the facsimile message includes updating a number of pages field on the facsimile cover page with the total number of pages (*see Fig. 4, step 408], Fig. 5B, step 528 and Fig. 6B, step 630*).

20. **Claim 8** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Tang et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,972,862) in view of **Bohan** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2003/0214681) in view of **Skantze et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,722,574) and further in view of **Brooks et al.** (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2002/0107885).

Referring to **claim 8**, Tang, Bohan and Skantze disclose the method as discussed above in the rejection of claim 2 but does not explicitly disclose the method further wherein the template determination utilizes the pattern.

Brooks discloses the method wherein the template determination utilizes the pattern (*see Fig. 4, form-identification area 165 wherein pen-enabled computer device 10 comprising writing stylus 40 designates form 160 from a form-identification area 165 [paragraphs 0040, 0041 and 0044]*).

Tang, Skantze and Brooks are combinable because they are both from the same field of endeavor, being pen-enabled computer devices within digital communication networks. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art to include a digital pen and pad to fill out fields, to designate options and to otherwise interact with a pattern on a particular medium, such as a pre-printed form, along with pen-enabled computer devices. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to better coincide user-entered digital data along with handwritten user data shown on the pre-printed form which also facilitates the user's awareness of any inconsistent selections between data written on the pre-printed form and data electronically written, as suggested by Brooks (*paragraphs 0003, 0007 – 0008 and paragraph 0047*).

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jamrog (U.S. Patent No. 5,861,958) discloses a multiple-file feature for a fax printer driver which allows a combination of multiple files into a single facsimile transmission via the computer application programs using the Anoto system (see *Abstract and Fig. 3*).

Nelson et al. (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2005/0052707 and 2005/0052706) disclose location patterns, such as Anoto patterns, wherein a printer is arranged to print a location pattern comprising a plurality of dots adapted to be read by a pattern reader (see *Abstract and see Figs. 1A, 1B, 2 and 5A*).

Mackenzie et al. (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2005/0052700) disclose printing digital documents containing a printed pattern of position identification pattern markings such as in the Anoto system (*see Abstract and see Figs. 1 – 4 and 12*).

Wiebe (U.S. Patent No. 6,586,688) discloses information related-devices and methods wherein a product has a surface provided with a first coding pattern and a second coding pattern such that each symbol in the first and the second pattern may have a value which, for example, can be indicated by the location of the marking belonging to the symbol in relation to a raster point in the first and second raster, respectively (*see Abstract and see Figs. 1 – 5*).

Pettersson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,674,427) disclose a method of providing a position code on a surface, which position code codes a plurality of positions on the surface (*see Abstract and see Figs. 1 – 4*).

Wiebe (U.S. Patent No. 6,689,966) discloses a method for determining positional information such that the position-coding pattern can be used in different contexts for position determination such as digitizing handwriting (*see Abstract and see Figs. 1 – 4*).

Kubo (U.S. Pre-Grant Publication No. 2007/0035774) discloses a print system including a print unit prints an electronic document together with print instruction specification information (i.e. document identifier) (*see Abstract and Figs. 3, 4, 6 – 8 and 10 – 12*).

Dougherty et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,076, 734) disclose systems for providing human/computer interfaces by engaging a sensor with desired regions of an encoded physical medium wherein the sensor may have at least one identification number

providing information such as user identify, sensor type, access type, or language type wherein the sensor can also transmit the certain decoded information together with the at least one ID to the computer system (*see Abstract and see Figs. 1 –3, 10 and 11*).

Fuoss et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,003,308 and 7,224,991) disclose a system for handwritten electronic messaging wherein the actual handwritten image message may be integral to the message field or an attachment to the e-mail (*see Fig. 2, step 212*).

MacLean et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,131,061) disclose a system for processing electronic documents using physical documents (*see Abstract and Figs. 1 – 4*).

Leichener et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,050,490) disclose a handheld writing device and related data entry system comprising a digital electronic clipboard is used to mount pages or forms, a stylus having a writing tip at one end of the stylus and a bar code scanning mechanism at another end of the stylus to enter data on the pages or forms and scan bar codes appearing on the pages or forms themselves or on a separate item to be associated with the form such that the system detects whether bar code data or stylus position data is being generated so to cause its CPU to responsively process entered data (*see Abstract and see Figs. 1 – 2*).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myles D. Robinson whose telephone number is (571) 272-5944. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler M. Lamb can be reached on (571) 272-7406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



MDR

6/11/07



Twyler M. Lamb
Supervisory Patent Examiner